

**REMARKS**

Upon entry of the foregoing amendment, claims 58, 62-81, 128, 132-144, 146-150, and 154-194 are pending, with claims 58, 128, 150, and 174 being independent claims. Claims 58, 62, 64-67, 70, 71, 76, 80, 128, 132-137, 140, 141, 143, 144, 146, 148, 150, 154, 156-159, 162, 163, 168, 172, 174, 176, 178-181, 183, 184, 189, and 193 are amended. Support for these changes can be found throughout Applicant's originally filed specification, including, *inter alia*, pages 8-21 of the written description and Figure 1 of the drawings. These changes are believed to introduce no new matter, and their entry is respectfully requested.

Based on the above amendment and the following remarks, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to reconsider and withdraw all outstanding objections and rejections.

**Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 101**

In the Office Action, claims 58, 62-81, 128, 132-144, 146-150, and 154-194 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as allegedly not supporting a specific and substantial asserted utility or a well-established utility. (Paper No. 20061028, page 2). To the extent that this rejection is based on the Examiner's rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112 (e.g., allegedly lacking antecedent support from the specification), Applicant believes the Examiner's concerns are addressed by the Applicant's remarks below. Notwithstanding the amendment and remarks herein, Applicant respectfully submits that this rejection is incomplete for lacking a detailed explanation for the allegedly deficient utility, and nonetheless without merit. (See MPEP § 2107). Each of the rejected claims recite a specific and substantial asserted utility as well as a well-established utility. The Examiner has failed to provide sufficient evidentiary support to establish a *prima facie* showing that any claimed

invention lacks utility. (See MPEP § 2107.02(IV)). Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the standing rejection, and allowance of the pending claims.

#### **Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112, First Paragraph**

In the Office Action, claims 58, 62-81, 128, 132-144, 146-150, and 154-194 are rejected under the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. § 112 as allegedly failing to comply with the written description requirement and not supporting a specific and substantial asserted utility or a well-established utility. (Paper No. 20061028, pages 2-3). To the extent that this rejection is based on the Examiner's rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 101 (e.g., allegedly lacking utility), Applicant believes the Examiner's concerns are addressed by the Applicant's remarks above.

The claims have been amended to better recite an embodiment(s) of Applicant's invention. Notwithstanding the above amendment, Applicant respectfully submits that the claims, previously presented and currently amended, are fully supported by Applicant's specification. Applicant respectfully directs the Examiner's attention to section V of Applicant's "Brief on Appeal Under 37 C.F.R. § 41.37," filed on June 30, 2006. In section V, Applicant has provided a detailed summary of the rejected claims, and has identified (by page and line number) support in the specification for each recited element and/or feature. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the standing rejection, and allowance of the pending claims.

#### **Conclusion**

All of the stated grounds of objection and rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider all presently outstanding objections and rejections and that they be withdrawn.

Applicant believes that a full and complete reply has been made to the outstanding Office Action and, as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is kindly invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided.

Prompt and favorable consideration of this Amendment and Reply is respectfully requested. The Commissioner is authorized to charge any deficiency or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-4270.

Dated: February 2, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

By: 

Kendrick P. Patterson  
Reg. No. 45,321

THELEN REID BROWN RAYSMAN &  
STEINER LLP  
900 Third Avenue  
New York, New York 10022  
Tel : (212) 895-2000  
Fax: (212) 895-2900  
**Customer No. 29858**

BRMPS1 969687v.1